Gary, Paul 11/7/69 Finck's N.O. testimonyl supplementary autopsy rpt.

I have completed the very rough draft of my analysis of Finck's New Orleans testimony. It is long (84 pp single spaced), may be loaded with serious typographical errors and also may, because of haste and work on it being broken up, contain other accidental error. I cannot, as I would like to, read it carefully and correct it now because there are other urgent things I should have done while I was doing that and I must now get to them. Without correcting it, I am reluctant to send it out and there is no urgency on that anyway. However, if either or you had any questions, please ask them and I will answer them promptly. My earlier opinion is unchanged. It is, in fact, stronger after another reading.

Among the things that fascinated me is his manner of dealing with the supplemental autopsy report, all of which I will not now go into. On the one hand, he didn't even take a copy with him, although it required copying but three pages, one of which is the record of transmittal. He pretended only the most casual knowledge of it, yet when it was in his opinion to his interest to make specific reference, he did, quite explicitly, including even the date of forwarding and by whom. All of this caused me to look at the printed copy of CE391 which, as you know, I have ordered from a different file than this one. However, this one bears the number 1221. Now this cannot be CE 1221, for I checked that (on Ruby and too late a number). Nor would it seem likely to be a Secret Service control number from both the number and the manner of recording it. I suppose it could be from a duplicating files with that many pages, but this, again, is but a guess and the repeating of the number at top and bottom is not consistent with practise there. But, it interests me and I'd like to learn if it can have any significance. There are other things about the printed copy that could have significance.

I will not now have time to pursue this further. I write to ask if either of you had noticed this, if you have any other ideas about what the number can be or mean, and whether, if you can think of any way of tracking it down for me, you would, please, for soon I hope to return to the autopsy work. That will begin with the rereading of the two books that are done. I'd appreciate it if you would if you can.

I've read much more testimony than either of you, for I spent some years publishing it, aside from the NC stuff. Never have I seen anyone as absolutely dishonest, and deliberately evasive-or as successful at it- as Finck. The pun on the name is both bad and apt.

Sincerely,